

PHED COMMITTEE #4
October 21, 2013
Worksession

MEMORANDUM

October 17, 2013

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee

FROM: Vivian Yao, Legislative Analyst *VY*
Marlene Michaelson, Senior Legislative Analyst *MM*

SUBJECT: **Status report -- combined registration system for Parks and Recreation**

The Committee will receive a status report on the efforts of the Department of Parks (Parks), Department of Recreation (Recreation), and the Office of Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) to develop a combined system for class and program registration and facility and athletic field permitting.

The following individuals are expected to participate in the discussion:

- Mary R. Bradford, Director, M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks
- Gabriel Albornoz, Director, Montgomery County Recreation Department
- Ginny Gong, Executive Director, Community Use of Public Facilities

The memorandum summarizing the joint work of the Departments to develop a single registration system is attached at ©1-3.

Background

In May 2010, the County Council adopted Resolutions No. 16-1373 and 16-1376 approving the FY11 Operating Budget for Montgomery County Government and the Montgomery County portion of the FY11 Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. As a condition of funds appropriated, the resolutions envisioned the development of a single-entry registration system for all program and classes operated by Parks and Recreation to be managed by County Government and the administration of all recreation facility and athletic field permitting by CUPF. The consolidation of these functions was intended to create a more streamlined, user-friendly system for County residents and result in budget savings and operational efficiencies.

In December 2010, a joint workgroup including all three departments transmitted recommendations responding to the Council resolutions (see ©4-23). The joint workgroup recommended the creation of one, fully merged database, administered and shared by all three agencies with a single entry point for registering for classes and programs and booking public space. The workgroup provided initial estimates of \$150,000-\$200,000 for consultant services, technology costs, and data entry support and the dedication of a minimum of 1.8 staff work years. Given fiscal constraints, no funding was made available to pursue the recommendation.

During the Committee's review of the FY14 operating budgets for the Department of Recreation and the Department of Parks, the Committee requested that the Departments move forward with the development of a combined registration system for class, program, and camp registration. The Departments reported that the discontinuation of the current self-hosted registration and permitting software used by each agency, CLASS, with its replacement new software called ACTIVE Net, created an opportunity to explore the development of a new shared system.

Update

Since July, the three Departments have worked along with County Department of Technology Services (DTS), the Department of Finance (FIN), M-NCPPC's Central Administrative Services Office (CAS), and Active Network consultants to identify the size and scope of a creating a consolidated system including conducting an in-depth review of business processes and discussing software functionality, revenue and accounting, and business practices. The business process review report developed by ACTIVE Network is attached at ©27-39.

The Departments highlight the following in their report:

- ***Features of ACTIVE Net system:*** ACTIVE Network can provide a PCI (Payment Card Industry) compliant, cloud-based registration system that offers a consolidated customer base, staff access anytime and anywhere, and built-in marketing and social media.
- ***Timeline for Implementation:*** It will take each agency approximately six to twelve months to migrate from CLASS to ACTIVE Net; however, it will take eighteen to twenty-four months to create a joint system given the complexity added by different financial systems and business practices. The report envisions securing a contract with ACTIVE Network by winter of FY14 and a go live date in FY16, provided resources are available in FY15.
- ***Identified Staffing Needs:*** The joint work group identified additional staffing needed to implement the new system: a project manager to oversee project implementation; accounting staff to ensure accurate financial and transactional data and correctly applied revenue; and centralized customer support center staffing to address customer questions and issues.
- ***Non-Personnel Implementation Costs:*** In addition to staffing resources, costs for configuring and implementing ACTIVE Net are estimated at an additional \$100,000.

The three Departments have collectively invested approximately \$57,000 for the business process reviews.

- **Operating Cost:** Once implemented ACTIVE Network will assess a transaction fee for class and program registration, membership sales, admissions facility permitting, POS, and field bookings. The Departments anticipate that the transaction fees will be to somewhat, but not completely, offset by the elimination of other costs of operating the current class system including maintenance fees, software licensing fees, credit card fees, and ongoing costs for PCI Compliance.
- **Challenges:** The Departments need to further assess current practices including customer policies and identify opportunities to standardize and simplify processes for customers and staff. In addition, the facility booking functionality provided by ACTIVE Net is geared toward individuals, not organizations, which poses challenges to how CUPF currently operates.

The Departments recommend creating a joint system despite the complexity and challenges involved, and will be working on unifying and consolidating business practices as it implements the new software.

Discussion and Follow-Up Issues

The status update memorandum indicates that Department representatives will present a more detailed status report on activities to date as well as an overview of opportunities, challenges, estimated costs and timeline, and proposed next steps for Committee's review and guidance at this meeting. The Committee may want to explore the following issues and request follow-up information to the extent that it is not available at the meeting.

Efficiencies: The memorandum suggests that internal efficiencies will be gained from consolidating registration systems; however, none are explained or quantified. It is unclear whether the system being explored keeps in tact the registration functions and staff of both the Parks Department and Recreation Department. Council staff is concerned that the new structure may build in redundant registration functions in both Departments.

The Committee may be interested in understanding what efficiencies can be gained through the consolidated registration system and whether efficiencies can be achieved by consolidating registration staff in a single unit that serves the new system and both Departments. Would the new function of centralized customer support be provided by staff that currently provides customer support for the two systems?

Staffing Costs: The proposed plan includes recommendations for additional staffing needed to implement the proposed system, but the costs for staff has not been quantified, nor is it clear which staff are needed solely for the roll out or for ongoing operation. The Committee should request this information.



MEMORANDUM

October 14, 2013

TO: Planning, Housing and Economic Development (PHED) Committee

FROM: Mary R. Bradford, Director of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks
Gabe Albornoz, Director of Montgomery County Recreation Department
Ginny Gong, Executive Director of Community Use of Public Facilities

SUBJECT: Update on Single Registration System and Inter-Agency Coordination

BACKGROUND

In May 2010 the Montgomery County Council adopted Resolution number 16-1373. This resolution required joint registration capabilities for Montgomery County Department of Recreation (MCRD) and that the Montgomery Parks Department of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Parks). The Council also required Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) to be responsible for facility permitting. The intent of Council's action, as stated in the Budget Resolution, is twofold:

1. "...create a more streamlined and user-friendly system for County residents..."
2. and, over time, achieve "...budget savings and operational efficiencies."

CUPF, MCRD and Parks are each committed to working together to share resources, create efficiencies, and streamline services in order to improve customer service. As of December 2010, all athletic field scheduling has been managed by CUPF, thus streamlining the way in which residents reserve fields. In addition, a Technology, Registration and Payment (TRP) workgroup staffed by Parks and Recreation employees have discussed a number of options related to creating a joint registration system.

CUPF, MCRD and Parks each recognize the many benefits a joint system would provide residents, and each entity has been working together towards implementing the Council's recommendation to create a streamlined, user-friendly system. In addition to offering one-stop shopping for all facility and athletic field permitting and class and program registration, a unified system will increase opportunities for collaboration and cross-promotion, standardization of business practices, and improved business intelligence. Furthermore, the current self-hosted registration and permitting software used by each agency, CLASS, is being discontinued and replaced with ACTIVE Net, which is a PCI compliant cloud-based system.

The task ahead in developing a joint system will require significant personnel and financial commitment from each entity. Beyond creating the elements of the database for each of the

modules (facility permitting, class registration, memberships, point of sale, etc), CUPF, MCRD and Parks will be looking at accommodating and, when possible, unifying business practices and new ways to collaborate.

We estimate that it would take each agency approximately six to twelve months to migrate from CLASS to ACTIVE Net individually. Due to complexity added by the different financial systems and business practices used across each agency, we estimate that creating a joint system will take eighteen to twenty-four months. Despite the added complexity, we believe that creating a joint system is the best way to proceed, and have approached this project collaboratively.

ONGOING COORDINATION

Over the course of the past several months, CUPF, MCRD, and Parks, along with the County Department of Technology Services (DTS), the Department of Finance (FIN), and M-NCPPC's Central Administrative Services Office (CAS) have worked together with representatives from Active Network, the nation's leading vendor for recreational registration systems, to examine how best to create the single data base, thus implementing the Council Resolution.

Beginning in July 2013, CUPF, MCRD, Parks, DTS, FIN, and CAS met with Active Network consultants to identify the size and scope of creating a consolidated system. In August 2013, representatives from all agencies, including staff from the County and M-NCPPC Information Technology and Finance offices, worked with Active Network representatives in a week-long series of meetings to conduct an in-depth business process review. Discussions included needs related to software functionality, revenue and accounting, and business practices. Additionally, CUPF along with staff from MCRD and Parks met with Active Network representatives again in late September to discuss CUPF's unique needs and implementation options for facility booking. The departments have collectively invested approximately \$47,000 thus far for the business process reviews.

Initial consultation work has demonstrated that Active Network can provide a cloud-based registration system that offers a consolidated customer base, staff access anytime and anywhere, and built in marketing and social media integration. However, in order to successfully complete this project, CUPF, MCRD and Parks need to assess current practices, including customer policies, and identify opportunities to standardize and simplify a number of processes for customers and staff. Although the ACTIVE Net software can be configured to support the various financial and accounting needs of each agency, we will need to identify reporting structures that will ensure transactions and revenues are allocated correctly. Additionally, the facility booking functionality provided through ACTIVE Net is geared towards individuals, not organizations. For this reason, CUPF, MCRD and Parks have already met with Active Network to discuss workaround options.

Because of these challenges, there will be considerable impact on the current system administrators among all three agencies; subsequently, there will be a need for additional resources as we consolidate our business practices and begin implementing the software.

RESOURCES NEEDED

Although some internal efficiency will be gained from consolidating registration systems, we anticipate that additional staff and funding will be required to implement and manage such a system. Staffing needs include a project manager responsible for overseeing the project implementation and ensuring key milestones are met, an accounting staff person to oversee accounting and ensure that financial and transactional data is accurate and revenues are applied correctly, and staffing for a centralized customer support center that will address customer questions and issues.

In addition to staffing resources, costs for configuring and implementing Active Network as our joint registration system are estimated at an additional \$100,000. Once implemented, Active Network will remit payments received for class and program registrations, membership sales, admissions, facility permitting, POS, and field bookings. Active Network will deduct a per transaction fee from this payment. The current proposed transaction fees are estimated to be \$900,000 to one million dollars based on our current usage per year (split among all three agencies). The transaction fees will only be somewhat offset by reductions in maintenance fees, software licensing fees, credit card fees, and ongoing costs for PCI Compliance (which each agency currently pays for in their current registration systems). Therefore, each agency will need to explore how they will absorb the added costs incurred because of the transaction fees. Possible solutions include increasing fees or passing the transaction fees onto users.

NEXT STEPS

We are committed to working through these challenges to create a joint registration system that will benefit our customers and agencies. Our proposed next steps include continued negotiations on the transaction fees with Active Network, with the goal of securing a contract by the winter of FY2014. Provided necessary resources are available in FY15, we anticipate that our joint registration system will go live in FY2016.

We will present a more detailed status report on activities to date, as well as an overview of opportunities, challenges, estimated costs and timeline, and proposed next steps for your review and guidance on October 21, 2013.

Attached: Joint Workgroup Report and Transition Plan Recommendations
 Memo: Update on Single Registration System and Inter-Agency Coordination
 ACTIVE Net Business Process Review, Montgomery County, MD



Montgomery County
RECREATION
DEPARTMENT

**Office of the Community Use of Public Facilities,
Montgomery Parks, M-NCPPC, and
Montgomery County Recreation Department**

**Joint Workgroup Report
and Transition Plan Recommendations**

December 3, 2010

Mission Statements:



Maximize the community's use of schools and other public facilities and to identify and facilitate activities and programs that respond to the community's needs without disrupting the instructional program of the Montgomery County Public Schools or County operations



Protect and interpret our valuable natural and cultural resources; balance the demand for recreation with the need for conservation; offer a variety of enjoyable recreational activities that encourage healthy lifestyles; and provide clean, safe, and accessible places for leisure-time activities.



Provide high quality, diverse and accessible programs, services and facilities that enhance the quality of life for all ages, cultures, and abilities.

Workgroup/Contributors

Ginny Gong, Director, CUPF	Mary Bradford, Director, Parks	Gabe Albornoz, Director, MCRD
Stephen Beach	Chip Bennett	Jeff Bourne
Peggie Cheung	Christine Brett	Mary Eno
Mark Geibig	Stephen Fancovic	Ginny Horvath
Liz Habermann	Gene Giddens	Sandi Kaiser
Paul Hibbard	Kate Stookey	Vicki Kane
	Rose-Marie Tomblin	Robin Riley
	Mary Ellen Venzke	Ed Trever
Jennifer Bryant OMB	Mark Clifton, ERP	Marlene Michaelson, CC
Lori O'Brian, OMB	Mauricio Delgado, Finance	Vivian Yao, CC
Amy Wilson, OMB	Craig Howard, OLO	

Table of Contents

- I. Executive Summary**
- II. Current Situation**
- III. Findings**
- IV. Recommendations**
- V. Projected Costs and Revenue Impacts**
- VI. Proposed Implementation Timeline**
 - a. Programs (already underway)
 - b. Permitting
 - i. Phase I: Athletic Fields (by December 2010)
 - ii. Phase II: Park Permit Office functions, MCRD Community Centers, etc. (coincide with database launch)
 - iii. Phase III: Review of other permit/rental functions (TBD)
 - c. Database (by November 2011)
 - i. Business systems reengineering (inc. financial): six months plus 5 days consulting time
 - ii. Hardware implementation: six months (simultaneous as BS, different people) plus 2 days consulting time
 - iii. Build database (including quality testing): four months plus 2 days consulting time and time for import support (CUPF facilities and organizational accounts only)
 - iv. Launch database/troubleshoot: class registration, memberships, POS, and rentals on different rollout calendars based on seasonality and how far out bookings go
 - d. Registration (start with summer camps session in Jan 2012)
 - i. Coincide with database launch

I. Executive Summary

In May 2010, the Montgomery County Council passed Budget Resolution 16-1373, which stipulated that the Montgomery Parks Department of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Parks), the County's Community Use of Public Facilities Office (CUPF), and the Montgomery County Department of Recreation (MCRD) work together to consolidate facility and athletic field permitting and class and program registration and the operation of classes, camps and trips except for ice skating/hockey, tennis, nature, interpretive, horticultural, and gardening programs and classes.

The intent of Council, as stated in the Budget Resolution, is to "...create a more streamlined and user-friendly system for County residents..." and, over time, achieve "...budget savings and operational efficiencies."

CUPF, MCRD and Parks are each committed to working together to share resources, gain efficiencies, and streamline services in order to improve customer service and reduce costs. Accordingly, over the course of the past several months, workgroups comprised of staff from each of the three agencies have met regularly to examine how best to implement the Council Resolution, and developed the recommendations contained within this report.

The budget resolution as adopted provided for a few exceptions to the consolidation efforts and enabled the retention of three separate databases within each of the three separate agencies. Continuing to pursue a fragmented approach, however, simply sustains the need for parallel systems, eliminating any true efficiency, and generates ongoing customer confusion over which agency offers which service as registration and permitting functions shift around in pieces from agency to agency.

It is the recommendation of the appointed workgroup to create one, fully merged database, administered and shared by all three agencies, that would include all MCRD and Parks classes and programs as well as all Parks, MCRD, and CUPF facility inventory. Users looking to book public space would have access via CUPF to any of the three agencies' facilities. Users looking for available classes and programs would be able to simultaneously search offerings from both Parks and MCRD. The public would have a single entry point for registering for classes and programs as well as booking public spaces, would need only one account, and would only need to pay once. With a single database and shared administration, the public would be able to walk into a Parks facility and sign up for a program offered by MCRD and vice versa. CUPF would be able to cross-market the facility inventory of all three agencies, while still enabling Parks to retain control over select Enterprise facilities and coordinate highly popular third-party events.

This will not be an easy task or a quick one. There are significant hurdles to overcome, including the alignment of each agency's separate business practices and the need to adhere to different accounting and financial requirements. These all appear to be surmountable; however, sufficient time must be allotted to working out these details if the consolidation is to succeed.

As a show of good faith, the transfer of Parks and MCRD field permitting to CUPF is already underway and should be completed in December 2010. In an effort to keep this transfer cost-neutral, CUPF will be absorbing the supervision, IT and financial costs of permitting MCRD and Parks fields for this first phase. The remaining transfer and consolidation steps are outlined in

the following pages, and are anticipated to be complete by the end of 2011, pending the impact of any additional budget reductions.

It is critical to remember that the looming budget reductions for all three agencies in FY12 may impact the timing and scope of the recommendations in this report. At the time of submission, none of the three agencies is in a position to describe what the impact will be to their respective work programs, but further reductions in personnel and supplies and materials may have significant impacts on our ability to undertake all of the recommendations contained within this report.

II. Current Situation

Parks, MCRD, and CUPF currently offer permits for the public use of a variety of public facilities including athletic fields, school auditoriums, classrooms, and gymnasiums, community centers, senior centers, aquatic centers, social halls, library meeting rooms, regional service centers, picnic shelters, park activity buildings, community garden plots, dog park permits, party rooms, and more. County residents must have an account with Parks to permit Parks facilities, a different account with MCRD to permit MCRD facilities, and a third account with CUPF to permit school, library or government building spaces. Customers interested in permitting any of the spaces offered by these agencies must potentially visit three separate websites or make three separate phone calls to determine availability or make a reservation. Should a customer be interested in booking multiple spaces from multiple agencies, multiple payments must be made utilizing multiple different processes.

Under the auspices of the Interagency Coordinating Board (made up of key decision makers), permitting of public space is CUPF's primary mission. As such, CUPF has become an expert in working community use in- and around the building owners operations. CUPF has a dedicated staff of 25 full-time employees (including 2 MCPS employees on loan and one position currently lapsed for the FY11 savings plan) and 2 part-time employees who perform various scheduling, accounting, administrative, child care coordination, and management functions related to facility booking. CUPF staff also works with MCPS to schedule hundreds of MCPS workers to support community use in schools.

Parks has a dedicated staff of 5 in its Park Permit Office who issue permits for the Parks' unmanned and unprogrammed spaces, such as picnic shelters and community garden plots. There are several actively programmed Park facilities that also offer event and party rentals. These rentals are coordinated and booked by the full-time staff located at these sites; this function represents a portion of their overall responsibility of managing the day-to-day programming and operations of these facilities. There is no centralized booking system at MCRD nor any dedicated permit or rental staff. Customers renting space from MCRD must submit their application in person at the desired facility. Similar to Parks, rentals in their community centers are coordinated and booked as a component of the duties of the full-time staff at these sites.

Parks and MCRD also make available to the public a wide variety of instructional, educational, interpretive, and recreational classes and programs, in addition to the open admission and self-directed activities offered at many of the facility sites. CUPF does not offer any programs or classes. In 2009, in response to OLO Report 2009-7: *Organization of Recreation Programs across the Department of Parks and Department of Recreation*, the two agencies developed program criteria to guide decisions about which programs should be offered by which agency in the future and established a Joint Program Alliance staffed by three representatives from each agency to apply this criteria, review and make decisions about new program offerings, ensure consistency for cost recovery and pricing, and facilitate collaboration. This Alliance continues to meet monthly, and has been effective in aligning programming offerings with each agency's core mission, promoting collaboration, and preventing direct programming competition between the two agencies. To supplement space for their programming, MCRD also utilizes school space, county buildings, libraries, and MNCPPC facilities.

III. Findings

1. All agencies operate under specific but different policies and guidelines (including fee structures) established by different methods and governing bodies. CUPF, MCRD and Parks each permit a number of athletic fields to many of the same user groups and follow similar permitting processes and schedules.
2. All agencies use one or more modules of the same software product ("CLASS"), a proprietary product offered by The Active Network, on separate, standalone databases, each using different versions and options for managing inventory, class and program registration, sports league scheduling, biometrics, facility booking, point-of-sale, memberships, and customer accounts.
3. The Active Network recommends a single database as the best solution to achieve the goals of the resolution. This is a significant undertaking and will require dedicated expert consultant services to import and/or create facility inventories and customer accounts.
4. In 2008, Montgomery Parks successfully consolidated its class and program registration and facility booking functions into one CLASS database (ParkPASS).
5. Each agency has a website customized to their operations, highlighting their own facilities, classes, or programs. While some linkages exist between the three sites, there is currently no joint interface customers can use to search availability or offerings among all three agencies.
6. Online registration is offered by MCRD and Parks for programs and classes. Some of the facilities permitted for public use by Parks can be booked online 24/7 directly by customers. To rent space at MCRD's Community Recreation Centers, the public must go directly to each individual Center in person.
7. CUPF does accept applications and payments online, but does not currently offer online booking directly by the customer due to the more complex requests they receive and the need to adhere to ICB priorities. CUPF's inventory of facilities generally requires coordination with other stakeholders before permits can be issued.
8. MCRD and M-NCPPC operations are funded through a combination of tax supported and Enterprise Funds. CUPF is fully a non-tax supported Enterprise Fund. The Parks Enterprise Fund currently operates its classes and programs with an average cost recovery rate of 123% and covers all operating expenses (including personnel), debt service, major maintenance, and capital improvement costs for its facilities, and requires immediate access to revenues to support its payroll and other operational requirements.
9. Each agency function follows a specific timeline. For example, MCRD and Parks programs are divided into winter, spring, fall, summer, and summer camp "seasons." MCRD's aquatics, teens, and sports programs run by school year. Parks and CUPF offer a two-season approach to field permitting, and CUPF also operates a two-season application approach to accommodate MCPS's academic programming needs.
10. CUPF, MCRD and Parks have each had to reduce staff size due to recent budget cuts. Specifically related to this transfer, the Park Permit Office staff complement has been

reduced by 2 career positions including the Park Permit Office Supervisor, which will be abolished in FY11.

11. A number of facilities host very specific programming or services and offer little or no opportunities for community use or present unusual implementation circumstances requiring further evaluation (cultural/historic structures, Enterprise event centers and party rooms, nature centers, e.g.). In these instances, MCRD and Parks staff charged with the overall management, programming and operations of a specific facility are also responsible for the rental of those spaces. Venues operated by the Enterprise Fund Program are managed differently and present unique challenges to consolidated permitting.
12. The Joint Program Alliance is currently charged with coordinating the provision of Parks and MCRD programming to prevent direct competition between the two agencies' offerings, guide the development of new programming, and promote collaboration.
13. Parks is not a member of the County IT network or financial system. A conduit must be created to provide Parks with access to the scheduling/registration database and a password-protected portal into CUPF's ICBweb site will need to be established to facilitate access to custom scheduling reports by Park Managers and other Park employees. Additional input by DTS Security staff will be needed to ensure security protocols are in place.
14. MCRD and CUPF comply with accounting practices under the oversight of the County Finance Department. In addition to accounting practices established by the Commission, Parks must also adhere to reporting and accounting practices established by State law.
15. MCRD and CUPF are able to use the County General Ledger and refund processing interfaces to the Oracle eBusiness (ERP) financial system. M-NCPPC tracks financial transactions via their own general ledger. Consolidation will require creation of new general ledger accounts and ERP interfaces, development of new reports to track financial transactions and methods of returning revenue. Other impacts will be increased need for auditing M-NCPPC funds, and oversight by Department of Finance staff.
16. MCRD and CUPF deposits are made into a County treasury account. Funds deposited are immediately available for County use and accrue interest (abeit very small). M-NCPPC facilities make deposits into a separate treasury account, and funds are made available as needed for M-NCPPC operations. Quick access to revenue is critical to support the operation of self-supporting Funds such as CUPF and the Parks Enterprise Division.
17. MCRD and CUPF make cash and check deposits into PNC, followed by notification of both cash/check and credit card revenue to the Treasury Division. Non-negotiable checks (nonsufficient funds, closed bank accounts, incorrect bank account numbers, etc.) are handled by FISERV, under contract with the County for this service. M-NCPPC operates with a similar parallel arrangement.
18. CUPF piggy-backs on DTS's contract with Skip-Jack for credit card transactions, while MCRD and M-NCPPC use Class's e-connect. MCRD and CUPF credit card transactions are channeled through the County's credit card merchant services contract with EVALON and incur a fee of 2.2% per transaction.

19. A portion of both CUPF's and MCRD's overhead paid to the County (approximately 13% of annual personnel costs) offsets the cost of services provided by DTS, ERP, the County Attorney, and the Finance Department. M-NCPPC does not utilize County support services.

IV. Recommendations

1. Establish a single database shared by all three agencies.

After discussion with The Active Network, staff from all three agencies recommends a single database as the best solution to achieve the goals of the resolution. It is our shared belief that a single database would more fully honor the intent of the budget resolution, providing customers with a single point of entry for researching, booking, registering, and paying for classes, programs, or rental space provided by all three agencies.

However, building the shared database is a significant undertaking requiring much preparation by the IT staff of each agency, and dedication of expert consultant services to assist in the import and population of combined facility inventories and customer accounts. There will be considerable upfront costs and some ongoing maintenance costs to develop and manage this shared system. Though this recommendation requires a lengthier implementation timeline, and will incur some upfront costs to develop, there are significant benefits:

- All CUPF, MCRD and Parks facility spaces will be consolidated in one system, meaning CUPF will be able to schedule community use for selected MCRD and Parks facilities and view availability for all
- All MCRD and Parks programs and classes will be consolidated in one system, meaning class registration can be initiated online by all customers and at any supporting facility
- Customers will be able to search all three agencies' inventories simultaneously for programs, classes, and rentable space
- Customers will have a single account and will only have to pay once, even if they book space from or sign up for classes offered by multiple agencies
- Parks, MCRD, and CUPF staff will all continue to have administrator access to enter and view data, and customized reports will be created as necessary to support specific work programs

This is a complex task, and will require many months to complete. There is no automatic way to combine the hundreds of thousands of client accounts and thousands of facilities and programs contained within these three separate database systems. A new database will need to be created from scratch, and all the data currently contained in each database would need to be entered either manually or with the help of a contractor to import select information. Before the new database can be built, a significant amount of time must be spent to evaluate the business processes for each agency in detail and reach agreement on standardizing many aspects of our current disparate financial and business management systems.

Parks and MCRD staff discussed the single database option as a possibility in their October 2009 Joint Workgroup Report, but did not select this as the preferred option because of the resources required to build the new system and restore existing client accounts. In that assessment, MCRD and Parks included the cost of creating new accounts for all users rather than requiring the users to create new accounts themselves. Providing this high level of customer service required considerable staff and consultant time for the manual entry of client account information and resulted in a significant price tag for implementation. The approach being recommended in this transition plan would require users to open a new client account themselves, thereby significantly reducing the amount of data entry for staff or a hired consultant.

It should be noted that a similar consolidation initiative was implemented in the late 1990's. Unfortunately, the substantive administrative burdens of managing shared customer accounts which create payables and receivables across agency lines became overly burdensome. For example, a customer was not able to register a child for a sports program offered by MCRD if they owed CUPF for overstaying their permitted use of a library room. Another example was a church group that booked a park field and a school gym at different times. A rain credit was issued for the field before they had paid for their gym rental. When the field credit was applied to their account, the system automatically used the field credit to pay for the gym rental, preventing a refund for the field use, giving MCPS the dollars needed for the Parks field refund to be issued.

For this reason, the implementation timeline allots a considerable amount of time to work through and align our various business systems and processes to try and find solutions that would mitigate situations like those outlined above. Significant staff and consultant resources will be required to build and test the database. As indicated in the transition plan timeline, six months have been reserved to review and align:

- **Financial processes**

Processes to be reviewed include: frequency and procedures for the transfer of revenue, cash flow reporting, auditing requirements, accounts receivable procedures, collections, reconciliation issues, deposit procedures, structure of GL accounts, integration with ERP systems, account adjustments, and short-and long-term staff resources needed.

Consolidation requires M-NCPPC to deposit fees collected for both programs and rentals into the County's bank account, with frequent financial transactions to transfer funds back to M-NCPPC to enable them to meet payroll and other financial requirements. A comprehensive accounting structure is critical to this process. Staff training will be needed to assure secure, prompt and appropriate handling of all financial transactions.

Any additional banking and financial liabilities related to M-NCPPC facility and program fee collection (eg. security of bank deposits, "bad check" losses, cost of issuing refund and replacement checks, managing mandatory State of Maryland reporting requirements for unclaimed checks, oversight of PNC agreements,

managing collection agency, collection efforts by the Office of the County Attorney, and credit card vendor contract, etc.) will be assumed by the County.

Accounting transactions cannot be carried over to the new database, resulting in a loss of historical accounting information and current balances. Much of this information will have to be archived for future reference, and considerable effort will be required to ensure proper reconciliation occurs prior to the launch of the consolidated database.

- **Business processes**

Processes to review include: linking payments, cancellation/change fees and policies, organizational vs. family accounts, refund policies, fee reduction/financial assistance policies, penalties, system authority and administrator rights, walk-in registration processes, point-of-sale inventory management, membership programs, security deposits, season groups, governing body/fee and policy approval procedures, fee consistency, payment plans, customized reports, and existing processes for new account creation.

A myriad of business practice and policy decisions will be needed beyond those related to information technology and finance. As this effort moves forward, the agencies will need to craft agreements which designate areas of authority and responsibility. Efforts to establish uniform fees and policies for use of facilities will involve input from all agencies and a determination of authority for final decisions. Currently, representatives from MCPS, CUPF and Parks meet quarterly to discuss field related issues and efforts such as streamlining permitting processes, fee and scheduling coordination, outreach to users, inclement weather procedures, and other topics. As changes are rolled-out, this collaboration will be expanded to address the expansion of permitting inventory and programming. Among the next steps are:

- Agreement on business rules and practices followed by staff in all locations (impacting technology and financial areas)
- Development of solutions and alternatives where consolidation and changes in software impacts functionality
- Designation of roles and responsibilities such as naming a "system manager" who oversees the technical operations and coordinates with the system administrators in each agency to make technical decisions

Pending the identification of costs to develop and manage a shared database system, MCRD, CUPF, and Parks may need to revise their revenue projections to offset those costs. Once these costs are known, Parks, CUPF and MCRD staff will provide this information to Council. The commitment of staff and resources to implement this recommendation may be impacted by future budget decisions. Any additional cuts in staffing or resource levels may alter the scope and timeline of this proposal.

Additional time has been allocated to address network, server and hosting issues, user support and staff training sessions, and outreach to residents to inform them of the

changes once the new single database is ready to be rolled out. Rollout is likely to vary depending on the seasonality of the offering to ensure a seamless customer experience. As outlined in the proposed timeline, full consolidation is anticipated to be complete by the end of the 2011 calendar year, assuming that the financial and personnel resources needed to execute these recommendations are still available within each agency.

2. Consolidate the permitting of athletic fields under CUPF by December 1, 2010.

CUPF and Parks each permit hundreds of athletic fields to many of the same user groups. The permitting windows, processes and procedures of these two agencies are similar, and most of the Parks' field inventory is already contained within the CUPF database (leftover from the consolidation initiative in 1996, this will need to be restructured, updated, and incorporated into the County GL and refund interfaces). The consolidation of this function is therefore fairly straightforward. Given the fact that the field permit application window for the Spring 2011 season begins on December 1, 2010, and the stated timetable of the budget resolution, this transfer is already underway and nearing completion.

CUPF has created inventory profiles for Park and MCRD fields in the CUPF database for the purposes of scheduling community use of all agencies' fields beginning with the Spring 2011 season. As of December 1, 2010, all field permit applications for MCRD, Parks and CUPF fields will be directed to CUPF. Due to the speed of this transfer, most of the permitting procedures followed by each agency will be honored through the coming Spring season. Over the course of the next year, staff will review and adopt best practices from each agency to streamline processes and improve service to field users.

Primary responsibility for the management of the Field Advisory Committee and Annual User Forums will also shift to CUPF. To better accommodate the user feedback currently obtained through these initiatives, CUPF staff recommends establishing a Field Advisory Committee as a dedicated ICB sub-committee (such a committee was in place for many years and disbanded around 1999). This committee, staffed by CUPF in collaboration with Parks and MCRD, would continue to host periodic user forums.

Parks and CUPF have developed a Memorandum of Understanding to guide the personnel, financial, and legal requirements of the transfer. This MOU will support the transfer of up to two Park Permit Office technicians who will be tasked with athletic field scheduling and relocated to the CUPF offices as of December 15, 2010. No staff from MCRD will be transferred to CUPF at this time. Permitting of the MCRD fields will be managed by CUPF and Parks staff and centralized through the CUPF office.

3. Transfer Phase II permitting functions to CUPF to coincide with the launch of the single database.

The second phase of the permitting transfer is anticipated to include MCRD and Parks facilities such as picnic shelters, park activity buildings, community recreation centers, primitive campsites, community garden plots, and dog park permits, among others. This

phase will include the transfer of up to three of the remaining Park Permit Office staff as well as the transfer of the non-personnel funding dedicated to that office for postage, mailings, and other supplies and materials. CUPF believes the additional permitting workload can be managed with a total of three of the Park Permit Office technicians. It is unknown at this time if any MCRD personnel will transfer to support the permitting of MCRD facilities or if this additional permitting work will be performed by CUPF or Parks permitting staff.

For the following reasons, we recommend the transfer of these functions occur as soon as the single database is built:

- Currently, Parks customers can reserve park activity buildings, picnic shelters, campsites, and community garden plots online. Online booking will be available through the merged, single database. However, CUPF's on-line facility request and payment application process is tailored to meet complex requests and does not currently allow for online facility booking directly by the customer. If these permit functions transfer prior to the launch of the single database, customers will lose the convenience of booking these facilities online 24/7. This would result in an increased work load for CUPF staff who would have to respond to the consequent increase in phone, walk-in, and mail/fax requests (for example, online reservations currently account for close to 60% of all picnic shelter reservations).
- Transferring the remaining Park Permit Office functions one-by-one or in small batches doesn't make sense. With a team of only five permit office technicians, there are no specialties: Each permit technician is equally responsible for the scheduling of all available Park facilities, as well as the supporting administrative, financial/accounting, and reporting functions. Identifying the appropriate number of staff to shift to support the transfer of one individual facility type would be a challenge, as the work years dedicated to the permitting of specific facilities represent pieces of several different employees, and in most instances do not comprise a full, dedicated work year.
- Customer confusion will be lessened if the remaining Permit Office functions transfer over in one large block. This will prevent each office from having to constantly reeducate customers on which office is currently providing permits for each facility type.

We recognize the benefit of providing customers with a single point of access for permitting public spaces; we believe this is the best way to implement this change logically and seamlessly, with as little customer inconvenience or confusion as possible.

4. Time registration consolidation to coincide with the launch of the single database.

Our recommendation is to consolidate all programs and classes within one database, thereby enabling Parks and MCRD customers to register for any Parks or MCRD class or program in any Parks or MCRD facility. To do this properly, staff recommends that the consolidation of all registration functions into a centralized database be done at the

same time. There is little benefit to retaining parallel registration structures within each agency and shifting a few programs here and there. This piecemeal approach eliminates any possibility of efficiency and is likely to cause great confusion among customers who no longer know where to go to register for a particular class or program that used to be administered by Parks.

For this reason, we are suggesting the full consolidation of registration into one shared database, which will be managed cooperatively. Each agency will retain administrator rights to the system and related staff will form a cooperative alliance that will review new business policies and practices, promote consistency among all agencies, and work within their own respective agency to ensure adherence to the jointly agreed upon policies and procedures.

While there is little doubt that the consolidation of class and program registration will make searching and registration easier for the public and continue to promote the cross-marketing begun with the joint Program Guide, it is important to note that there are significant financial impacts for Parks.

The consolidation of registration as outlined will mean all funds collected for Parks programs – including those offered by Enterprise facilities – will be deposited into County accounts. The Parks Enterprise Fund is a self-sustaining fund, successfully covering all of its operating costs (including personnel), as well as related debt service, maintenance, and capital improvement costs. This Division of Montgomery Parks has been able to keep programs affordable while maintaining an average cost recovery rate of 123%. It is critical to its continued success that all revenues generated through its classes, programs, admission fees, and merchandise sales (all of which will be collected by the County through the consolidated system) are made immediately available to support its ongoing operational needs. To keep the Enterprise Fund functioning, these revenues will need to be transferred to M-NCPPC on a weekly basis so it can cover payroll and other financial requirements.

5. Review Phase III facilities to assess feasibility of transfer.

Phase III facilities are actively programmed facilities that contain a limited amount of available public space which is used primarily by groups who want to access the recreational or program offerings of that particular facility. These include MCRD community centers and aquatic centers, and Parks Enterprise facilities. The spaces available for rental in these facilities are frequently used by the facility staff for their own programs and events, and public use of these spaces is generally tied to a particular program or function of the facility.

It is difficult to separate out these spaces from the operation of the facility in which they're contained. These facilities are typically seven-day-a-week operations, offering a constantly shifting and varied program schedule which requires the regular use of all available spaces. Daily control over these spaces allows the facility team to expand program offerings when needed, introduce new programs as demand dictates, and test

out pilot programs to add to the regular schedule. Unlike schools, there is never a time when these facilities are not being operated in support of their primary goal, making staff access to and control of all available space a critical component of their operational success. Additional discussion and analysis is needed before any decision regarding the transfer of permitting these spaces is made.

It is important to remember that a consolidated database will allow a simultaneous search of all publicly available spaces, including those included in the Phase III list above. Customers interested in booking any of these spaces will still only need one account, and while they may need to contact these facilities directly to book the space, the reservation would be made through the consolidated database and therefore visible to all with access.

6. Develop a marketing plan to promote the consolidated database.

MCRD, CUPF and Parks will need to work together to create a marketing plan to support the launch of the consolidated database. The public will need to be educated about the benefits of the new system and encouraged to open an account, and existing customers will need to be informed of the need to recreate a new account in the new system. MC311 call staff will need to be informed of the changes and trained. Changes to all three agencies' websites will also need to be made to make it easy for the public to search for, find, and pay for classes, programs and permits, regardless of which agency is offering the service.

Parks has a robust web presence dedicated to the permitting of its public spaces. MCRD lists on its website contact information related to facility use. Information on MCRD and Parks program and class registration and facility booking is available through the joint Program Guide. CUPF allocates no specific marketing budget, but communicates via web-pages, quarterly newsletters, emails, and new user orientation classes. Much of the notification and outreach can be done electronically, but there will be some hard costs that will have to be shared by all agencies.

7. Strengthen the Joint Parks and Recreation Program Alliance.

One of the primary recommendations of the Joint Parks and Recreation report in 2009 in response to the OLO Report from 2008 was to establish a Joint Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (JPRA). The role of this committee is to review program strategies in advance of implementation to ensure that the elimination of duplication and that programs leverage resources to create savings where possible. Both agencies strongly believe this committee represents the best method to coordinate programming.

The Committee has been meeting since Spring 2009. However, due to significant transition as a result of retirements and a reduction in force, MCRD has had to assign different staff members to the committee at different times. This has disrupted the continuity and led to some confusion. To address this issue and ensure that policy

decisions can be made in real time, both the Director of Parks and the Director of Recreation have agreed that they will now actively participate and attend these meetings. This should help to strengthen the advisory capacity of JPRA.

V. Projected Costs and Revenue Impacts

Phase 1

Projected Costs:

The hard costs for the implementation of Phase I are minimal although it has required significant staff time. CUPF, MCRD and Parks staff have been working closely together to ensure the smooth transition of athletic field permitting to CUPF in time for the scheduling of the Spring/Summer 2011 season. An MOU is in the process of being executed between Parks and CUPF to support the transfer of up to two Park Permit Office technicians who will be tasked with athletic field scheduling and relocated to the CUPF offices as of December 15, 2010.

In the interest of moving this piece of the transfer forward and keeping the transfer cost-neutral, CUPF will be absorbing the costs of supervision, IT and financial support for the athletic field permitting function. Parks will be providing CUPF with a portion of the non-personnel budget dedicated to the Park Permit Office to offset any extra postage, mailing, and office consumables expenses. Parks will also cover the cost of parking for both Permit Office employees relocating to the CUPF offices, which is estimated to be \$80 per month per employee, for a total of approximately \$1,000 for the remainder of FY11. This cost and the cost of processing credit card transactions for Parks athletic fields (already budgeted as an expenditure in the Parks budget) will be charged against the revenue collected by CUPF for Park field permits.

It is important to note that some cost savings have already been achieved as a result of this merger: two Park Permit Office positions have already been frozen and will be abolished in FY11 in anticipation of this merger. These positions include one part-time career permit office technician position as well as the full-time career permit office supervisor position. Additional efficiencies may be achieved over the next 1-2 fiscal years as staff work together to streamline the permitting processes.

Projected Revenue Impacts:

No sizeable increase in athletic field revenue is anticipated as a result of this transfer, as a majority of current county fields are already permitted at maximum capacity. Parks anticipates generating between \$500,000 and \$750,000 in athletic field revenue in FY12. Actual revenues depend heavily on the weather and the consequent number of rainout credits that must be issued. These revenue projections may also need to be adjusted based on the anticipated costs of transferring the permitting responsibility of Parks fields to CUPF.

Phase II

Projected Costs:

The costs for Phase II are not fully known at this time. Parks, MCRD and CUPF staff has had preliminary discussions with consultants, CLASS system representatives, and internal departments in an attempt to estimate what costs may be incurred through the consolidation of all registration, point-of-sale, membership, inventory management, and permitting functions into one shared database.

At this time, based on the initial discussions staff has had to-date, the projected resources needed for the implementation of the shared database are estimated to be approximately

\$150,000-\$200,000, which includes consultant services, technology costs, and data entry support, plus the dedication of a minimum of 1.8 staff work years.

There will also be additional costs incurred by CUPF to support permitting staff and administrative functions. These will also need to be clarified within the first six months of the proposed timeline. CUPF anticipates they will be able to cover the additional costs through increased revenues and enhanced customer service. This may have a consequent impact on the revenue projections for MCRD and Parks in FY12 and beyond.

This phase also includes the consolidation of registration through the development of a shared database. It is not known at this time what the costs to each agency will be to create this shared system. As staffing levels within all three agencies have already been reduced, no additional staff reductions are anticipated. There are likely to be some cost-savings through the central management of the system contract and licensing, but the extent of these savings is not yet known.

Since all revenue for all Parks, MCRD and CUPF classes, programs and rentals, memberships, open admission fees, inventory sales, and point-of-sale purchases will be funneled through the County, extensive work will need to be done to establish financial processes that transfer funding back to M-NCPPC in a timely way to support their ongoing operations. This is especially important for the Parks' Enterprise Division, which is fully self-sustaining and relies on access to its cash flow to maintain its services and fulfill its payroll and other financial requirements. Initial discussion shows there may be an automated way to make this transfer, which would mitigate the need for additional staff resources. However, once the money is transferred, M-NCPPC will be tasked with ensuring the right amounts are placed into the right accounts and monitoring the financial reports provided to make sure the appropriate amount of revenue is being transferred.

As staff work through the business systems reengineering and hardware implementation and hosting issues in the first six months of the timeline, the costs of the consolidated database will be refined. Staff will report to Council once actual costs are known.

Projected Revenue Impacts:

CUPF anticipates a sizeable increase in revenue (up to 25%) from the centralized permitting of MCRD's Community Recreation Centers. A smaller increase (around 2.5%) is anticipated for Parks facilities. As stated above, the transfer of the remaining Park Permit Office function as well as additional MCRD permitting functions will incur some costs for CUPF which will have to be covered through revenues generated from the MCRD and Parks facilities.

It is unclear at this time whether the projected increase in revenue will be sufficient to fully offset the additional costs and workload incurred by CUPF. Additional budget cuts for Parks and MCRD may well result in a continued decline in maintenance for these facilities, which may lead to decreased revenue overall. This will be further explored by CUPF, MCRD and Parks staff during the preparation phase of the timeline, and shared with Council.

VI. Proposed Implementation Timeline*	FY2011							FY2012						
Objectives and Tasks	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J
Programming														
Continue Joint Program Alliance (monthly)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Transition to single database														
Business systems reengineering	x	x	x	x	x	x								
Hardware implementation/hosting			x	x	x	x								
Report back to Council on status and actual costs of Phase II						x								
Database build/creation							x	x	x	x	x			
User training/support										x	x	x		
Marketing/outreach										x	x	x	x	x
Staggered rollout												x	x	x
Permitting														
Phase I: Parks and MCRD athletic fields transfer to CUPF	x													
Phase II: Parks picnic shelters, park activity buildings, primitive campsites, community garden plots, dog park permits, outdoor courts, Woodside gym, Ridge Road rink, vendor permits, MCRD community centers (anything else from MCRD?) transfer to CUPF												x		
Phase III: Review remaining permit/rental functions to assess feasibility (includes special event permits, nature center party rooms, Enterprise event centers and party rooms)													x	x
Registration														
Class/program registration for all MCRD and Parks programs in single database												x		

* Timeline and implementation subject to availability of needed resources.

MEMORANDUM

April 24, 2013

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee

FROM: Mary R. Bradford, Director of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks *MBradford*
Gabe Albornoz, Director of Montgomery County Recreation Department - *GAlbornoz*

SUBJECT: Update on Single Registration System and Inter-Agency Coordination

We look forward to our upcoming discussion with you on the status of coordination between M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks (Parks) and the County's Recreation Department (MCRD) and our recommended next steps for a single registration system for our agencies.

We agree a single registration system is a good idea, and our staff has continued to search for viable options at a reasonable cost since our discussion with Council in FY10. This memo provides information on the various efforts and discussions by our agencies over the past few years.

BACKGROUND

In FY10, our Joint Workgroup Report proposed the creation of a searchable portal with a single sign-on so customers would need only one PIN or ID number to register for programs or reserve facilities offered by Parks, MCRD and CUPF. The price tag for our recommended option was estimated to be at least \$250,000 with a timeline for implementation of 12-18 months. We explored all existing software solutions available on the market and each presented the same challenges – primarily, 1) enabling full network access to a shared system for staff of both agencies in multiple locations and 2) ensuring the revenue could flow into two separate accounting systems to support the Enterprise Fund's need for immediate access to its capital. Regardless, staff believed these obstacles could be overcome through the development of customized software and the commitment of appropriate resources.

Given the economic climate at the time, however, no funding was made available to undertake this effort, and the subsequent budget cuts in FY11 and FY12 meant that both agencies were occupied instead with the challenge of maintaining core services with fewer resources.

ONGOING COORDINATION

Since then, our agencies have continued to explore less costly alternative solutions to jointly promote our programs and improve coordination in other critical areas identified through our FY10 discussions with Council as outlined below:

- In February 2009, Parks and MCRD produced our first digital Program Guide, available online so customers visiting either agency's website could view and access information on the classes and programs offered by the other;
- In February 2010, Parks and MCRD launched the multi-year Vision2030 effort, which led to the joint development of cost recovery targets, provided comprehensive research on current and

future public demand for parks and recreation facilities and services, and facilitated ongoing interagency coordination on the development of both agencies' CIP work programs;

- In June 2010, Parks and MCRD staff kicked off our regular monthly meetings of the Joint Parks and Recreation Alliance (JPRA) which reviews and makes decisions about new program offerings, ensures consistency for cost recovery and pricing, and facilitates collaboration on programs and events;
- In December 2011, both agencies partnered with Activity Rocket (www.ActivityRocket.com), which provides a shared, searchable portal for classes and programs for youth up to the age of 18, to promote our programs;
- In June 2012, the Planning Board approved the installation of a Dryland Diving Training Facility at Wall Local Park, a public-private partnership developed in collaboration with Parks to supplement the programming offered by MCRD at their Wall Park indoor pool;
- In November 2012, staff coordinated a software demo from Active Systems for Parks, MCRD, the County's Office of Community Use of Public Facilities (CUPF) and local municipalities;
- In January 2013, staff coordinated a software demo from Vermont Systems for Parks, MCRD, CUPF and local municipalities;
- In January 2013, Parks and MCRD produced our first joint Summer Camps Guide so all five annual publications now include program listings for both agencies;
- In January 2013, Parks invited MCRD to participate in (and benefit from) the Parks' Corporate Sponsorship Program, which is currently in development;
- In February 2013, Parks and MCRD staff met with the County's Chief Innovation Officer to explore the creation of an online, web-based searchable class and program directory with a shared URL to facilitate joint marketing and the ability to include other county agencies and municipalities;
- In June 2013, Parks and MCRD are cohosting a large, countywide Health and Wellness event at South Germantown Recreational Park, and continue to coordinate on other large community events.

CURRENT OPPORTUNITIES

Ongoing conversation and the scheduled presentations in November 2012 and January 2013 by Active and Vermont Systems, the only two existing companies capable of providing a registration and booking software solution for agencies with our current volume of business, proved disappointing, as neither existing system is able to adequately address the difficulty of providing countywide network access to one shared server or the need for separate accounting without customization at significant cost.

Earlier this month, however, an unexpected announcement by Active about a brand new software solution called Active.Net may provide the answer to our continued search for a viable "turnkey" single registration system.

The new software is web-hosted – thus avoiding the problem of providing interagency access to a single shared server – and Active claims it is able to direct revenue to multiple accounting systems – thereby ensuring immediate access by each agency to its earned income. (More information can be found at: www.activecommunities.com/technology-solutions.htm.)

Given that Active's CLASS software (the program registration and facility booking software currently used by Parks, MCRD and CUPF) is likely to become obsolete and no longer supported by Active as a result of the new software they've introduced, we are presented with an ideal opportunity to invest in the creation of one new, shared system for all agencies.

NEXT STEPS

MCRD, Parks and CUPF have scheduled a presentation by Active on the Active.Net solution for June 3-4, 2013, and have invited Marlene Michaelson and Vivian Yao to attend.

This demonstration is necessary before we can provide the PHED with accurate information about this opportunity and the associated costs and timeline to implement a single registration system.

Staff is proposing to return to the PHED no later than July 31, 2013, with an implementation plan that would include a timeline, anticipated resources needed to implement and sustain a new, shared system, and a supplemental request for additional funding in FY14 (if needed) as well as estimated needs for FY15 and beyond.



ACTIVE Net Business Process Review Montgomery County, MD

Dates: August 26 – 30, 2013

ACTIVE Net Resources:

**Mike Schultz, Project Manager
Josh Rodrigues, Project Consultant**

If you have any comments, questions or feedback concerning this or any other consulting engagement and the quality of our service delivery please click here [<http://www.activecommunities.com/en/consulting-survey>] and let us know.

CONTENTS

Overview	2
Project Goals	2
Assumptions	2
Constraints	3
Risks	4
IT Resource Review	5
Accounting	5
Facility Reservation Review	6
Activity Registration Review	7
Membership Registration Review	8
Point Of Sale Review	9
Project Scheduling	9
Project Team	10
Outstanding Tasks	11
Deliverables	12



OVERVIEW

Montgomery County is currently broken down into different business entities that function independently of each other. Montgomery County's Community Use of Public Facilities Office (CUPF), Montgomery Parks Department of MNCPPC (Parks) and Montgomery County Department of Recreation (Recreation) – hereby defined as "the County" for purposes of this document – are looking to shift from their current separate CLASS databases onto a single shared platform and database in ACTIVE Net. The intent of the Business Process Review was to address critical project and planning requirements regarding the adoption of ACTIVE Net and identify any critical related implementation issues pertaining to the migration.

PROJECT GOALS

As determined from the initial planning discussions, the primary goals of the project include:

- Improved customer service, specifically:
 - Increased process flexibility for processing transactions; and
 - A more seamless and user friendly online experience.
- Increased revenue;
- Standardization of business units;
- Increased business capabilities, through:
 - More advanced processing functionality; and
 - Improved business intelligence.

ASSUMPTIONS

Project assumptions are circumstances and events that need to occur for the project to be successful but are outside the total control of your project team. They are considered to be true, real or certain without proof or demonstration. The assumptions provide a historical perspective when evaluating project performance and determining justification for project-related decisions and direction.

Based on the initial planning discussions that took place during your implementation, the project assumptions are listed below. If an assumption is invalidated at a later date, the activities and estimates in your project plan should be adjusted accordingly.

FUNCTIONAL AREA	ASSUMPTION
Resource	Project staff / IT resources will be available when and as they are needed.
Resource	Required hardware resources will be available when and as they are needed.
Environmental	Issues will be identified and resolved in a timely manner.
Environmental	Business needs will support the execution of the project.

CONSTRAINTS

The primary impact of project constraints is the likelihood of delaying the completion of the project. Therefore if a constraint proves to be true, the project suffers, if it is not true, the project benefits. The focus of addressing constraints is to prioritize and allocate resources (within reasonable limits) in order to minimize impact to the project.

Based on the initial planning discussions that took place during your implementation, the project constraints are listed below. If a constraint is invalidated at a later date, the activities and estimates in your project plan should be adjusted accordingly.

FUNCTIONAL AREA	CONSTRAINT	MITIGATION
Resource	Numerous differences exist between Core Business Units with respect to IT resources, software, and management.	A central management plan is required to ensure that IT resources are managed to respond to the changing requirements of ACTIVE Net.
Resource	Key project staff requirements may not be available in a timely fashion (due to budget constraints) or available on only a part-time basis.	Project scheduling could be adjusted accordingly to compensate for reduced staff availability. A detailed plan for delegation of authority and decision making should be developed, regardless of the presence of a dedicated Project Manager.
Environmental	A significant number of business policies and procedures differ significantly between the three Core Business Units. Others may be potentially unclear, not enforced, or non-existent.	A comprehensive set of business policies must be ascertained, documented, communicated, and most importantly – enforced well in advance of implementation where practical. The County should strive for as much consistency in application as possible.
Environmental	A significant percentage of the end users lack sufficient experience with the operating / technical environment.	Additional time should be scheduled into the project plan to develop, execute, and validate staff training requirements where shortcomings are identified.
Environmental	Three distinct Core Business Units are intended to merge operations into a single database. Determining ownership and managing advocacy of issues impacting all three units presents its own unique challenges.	Utilize the existing governance mechanisms created for the project to assist in achieving closure on issues both during the project as well as post go-live. It is also recommended to employ a Project Manager and Primary System Administrator that is not directly affiliated with any of the Core Business Units.
Environmental	The scope of the project is subject to change pending further decisions.	Additional time should be scheduled into the project plan to develop and confirm information prior to completing scheduled implementation sessions.
Functionality	The success of the project depends upon the ability to execute on specific functionality requirements (such as organizational accounts being able to transact via Public Access).	A comprehensive list of functionality requirements that are critical to success needs is necessary in order to assist in articulating development priorities.
Budgetary	Budget allocations for implementation are limited and additional funds cannot be allocated until the new fiscal year.	Consider a graduated implementation of modules, deferring some until a later fiscal year or at least until key modules or functions have been successfully implemented.

RISKS

Project risks are characteristics, circumstances, or features of the project environment that will potentially have an adverse impact on the project or the quality of its deliverables if they occur. In other words, whereas a constraint is a current problem that must be dealt with, a risk is a potential future problem that has not yet occurred. All projects will contain some risks. It may not be possible to eliminate risks entirely, but they can be anticipated and managed through proper planning, thereby reducing the probability that they will occur. The list provided below includes risks identified during your formal implementation sessions and will provide a basis for further development of a detailed Risk Assessment.

Risk	CONSEQUENCE	RECOMMENDATION(S)
A critical functionality requirement may not identified until well after project initiation.	Missing functional requirements will impact business productivity and potentially even capabilities.	Identify all critical functional requirements and gaps that may require development work prior to commencement of the project.
Despite due diligence at the time of data entry, the possibility exists for major errors exist within the database.	Data integrity is essential for ensuring that erroneous transactions do not take place, and there is no staff confusion regarding data entities.	ACTIVE Net has a variety of reports that can be used for auditing. Ensure that the data contained in these reports is checked for completeness and accuracy.
Staff may be resistant to adoption of the technology and/or the integration strategy.	Untrained staff or degraded skill sets can potentially result in erroneous transactions as well as missed information. This in turn will impact customer satisfaction.	Ensure formal change management efforts are included in the Project Plan. Incorporate feedback mechanisms to facilitate adoption.
Hardware / technology requirements may fail.	Hardware failures will result in the inability to complete transactions and provide information required by customers and staff, potentially affecting revenue and customer satisfaction.	Ensure backup hardware components and supplies are available to quickly address failures and/or potential shortages.
Required policy decisions may not be made in a timely fashion, or consensus will not be achieved.	Incomplete or missing policies that affect business processes but are not implemented will result in erroneous transactions and procedural inconsistencies.	Important policy decisions should be made well in advance of configuration and Go-Live. Consensus will be critical to ensuring project success.
Unaccounted project variables may result in budget or schedule slippages.	Inability to complete originally intended modules and components will result in lack of functionality or rescheduling of implementation training.	Project planning documentation should be completed as thoroughly as possible, including a detailed Risk Analysis.
Sales contract is not signed off with sufficient time to initiate project.	Project timelines and associated services are directly dependent on completion of the sales process.	Go-Live dates for relevant modules should be assessed in light of when services will be available.
ACTIVE Net capabilities may not provide the desired level of reconciliation and reporting capabilities.	Detailed reconciliation processes may need to be performed to ensure financial reporting integrity is maintained.	A comprehensive analysis of financial reporting tools should be conducted early in the project to identify any potential shortcomings.



IT RESOURCE REVIEW

As a web based application, ACTIVE Net does not require installation however, ActiveNet does require three third party applications to function properly. All workstations are expected to have a specific version of Adobe Acrobat Reader, Adobe Flash and Oracle Java installed as they affect components within ACTIVE Net. As of the time of this writing the supported versions are listed below, however it is important to note that it is recommended that automatic updates of all applications be turned off. If the need to upgrade arises the latest supported versions of third party applications can be found in the ActiveNet customer portal (<https://activesupport.secure.force.com/customerportal>).

- Adobe Acrobat Reader (10.1.1 or greater) – Reports are preferred to be run in ACTIVE Net in Adobe.
- Oracle Java (6.31 or greater) – Required by numerous components in ACTIVE Net.
- Adobe Flash (11.2.202 or greater) – The Enhanced Customer View (Advanced Customer Management) and Resource Scheduler components require Flash.
- Internet Explorer is the only officially supported browser for the Staff Interface and it is recommended to use version 8 or better.

FUNCTIONAL MODULES

It was determined during discussions that Parks and Recreation would likely be employing all modules, whereas CUPF would likely employ only the Facilities and Memberships modules. As "licensing" is treated differently in ACTIVE Net as compared to CLASS, there are no restrictions regarding how many locations may use a functional module, so long as the database has been enabled for it. Proposed transactional functions for Public Access include Registrations, Memberships, and potentially some Facility Rentals.

All three units, but particularly CUPF, have very specific reporting requirements that may not necessarily be resolved by utilizing the stock reports available in ACTIVE Net. Ad Hoc reporting may offer a solution to bridge the gaps between CLASS and ACTIVE Net.

SOFTWARE UPGRADES AND MAINTENANCE RELEASES

Software upgrades are a standard part of any software package to keep up with technology, provide enhancements and bug fixes. The following release cycle options are available:

- Standard Upgrade
 - Consists of one major release every year.
- Early Adopter Upgrades
 - Consists of those clients who choose to receive updates earlier and more frequently. Clients agree to the risks involved with being an early adopter.
 - During the implementation stage all clients are by default on the early adopter.

All major upgrades are deployed to the Trainer Database before they are deployed to the Live Database. During this period, access to copy to trainer functionality is unavailable.

ACCOUNTING

Montgomery County currently uses CLASS which serves as their primary financial sub-ledger that provides the transactional data to be entered into their respective general ledgers. Most centers close out every day with the manager/supervisor responsible for running the end of day reports.

In terms of mechanics, ACTIVE Net operates on a full accrual revenue recognition system with an option to defer revenue on a yearly, monthly, or daily basis (see *ACTIVE Net Accounting Manual* for detailed transaction breakdowns). It is designed to provide a batch summary of account postings for a single journal entry into an accounting system rather than



entering individual transactions into a General Ledger system. Montgomery would be deferring rentals daily, membership revenue would be recognized on the day of purchase and activities would be deferred annually.

Along with providing an accounting sub-ledger, ACTIVE Net is designed to utilize an integrated credit card processing service (AMS) for both front desk and online transactions. ACTIVE Net's accounting and reconciliation processes are all designed around the use of AMS as the sole credit card processor for all transactions.

Each fee and discount in ACTIVE Net can also be assigned to an individual revenue account as required. At the time of transaction, invisible to the user, ACTIVE Net performs the GL postings associated with that transaction. If the services associated with a transaction take place outside of the current deferral period (yearly, monthly, or daily), ACTIVE Net will post to a single deferred revenue GL account. Revenue will be transferred from deferred revenue to the revenue account associated with the service automatically on the first day of each following period. For details on the postings performed by ACTIVE Net during each transaction, as well as a list of required GL accounts please refer to the Accounting Manual.

As opposed to CLASS, ACTIVE Net divides the A/R general account into an A/R (customer debits) and A/P (customer credits) and does not automatically apply customer credits against their receivables. Additionally, each customer has their own individual account for recording financial transactions, as opposed to family accounts in CLASS.

ACTIVE Net provides a Cash Receipts Report (example available in the manual) for each workstation/user for the purposes of reconciliation of physical monies. Additionally, the Account Distribution Report is available to generate totals for the GL Accounts in a given time period that are necessary to update an organization's primary General Ledger. This report can be configured to the format of a CSV file, permitting a manual upload into an organization's primary accounting software platform.

FACILITY RESERVATION REVIEW

The three business units comprising the Organization collectively manage a large number of facilities (CUPF manages approximately 300 distinct locations, Parks 25 and Recreation 37). The most challenging aspect of integrating the three units into ACTIVE Net will likely revolve around the components of this module. Some key observations noted during the implementation include:

RESIDENCY

CUPF, Parks and Recreation currently have different criteria for determining residency. As residency in ACTIVE Net is based off of a single set of criteria (due to a single customer base), all three agencies would be required to achieve consensus on a single definition of what constitutes a resident. Also note that the residency trigger is currently only maintained for individual customer accounts and would have to be maintained manually for organizational accounts. Residency will most likely be determined by Zip Codes (pending further discussions and confirmation across the board).

CUSTOMER CATEGORIES

Customer Types are used in ACTIVE Net to sub-divide categories of customers as well as help automate pricing rules (mainly for rentals). As the customer database will be shared between all three business units, the Organization will need to arrive at a single list of Customer Types. Parks and Recreation have a set rate schedule for rentals which is not consistent with CUPF. A single categorization scheme is necessary in order to consolidate operations by all three units.

BOOKING TYPES

Much like CLASS, ACTIVE Net has the capability of producing Internal bookings such as Administrative or Maintenance bookings. One of the main challenges of integrating the three units into one database concerns the need for CUPF to accurately record booking costs for these internal bookings. A variety of options to address this was discussed. One option involves allowing permits only to create reservations (as opposed to both activities and permits). Alternately, if multiple booking are needed at the same time slot along with tracking capabilities, ACTIVE Net has the ability to generate non-exclusive (concurrent) reservations. The Organization also has special situations and vendors that would require the use of this functionality.



PERMIT APPROVAL TRACKING

ACTIVE Net utilizes permit statuses that allow for the creation of tentative bookings with set expiry dates. The permit can then be approved if it is finalized or placed on hold if it has been checked and pending approval permission. All permit status changes are emailed to customers.

ACTIVE Net also utilizes approval stage sequences to allow facility requests to be channeled through customer service representatives and approved by managers reducing the need for managers to perform data entry. Different stage sequences can be configured to accommodate different business scenarios. A stage sequence can have any number of stages associated with it. Each stage requires a member of staff to review and approve the rental agreement. Once all stages have been approved, the customer is emailed a confirmation.

RENTALS IN PUBLIC ACCESS

ACTIVE Net offers several different functions for handling facility rentals in Public Access: facility availability, rental requests, rental booking, quick reserve, and interactive map bookings:

- **Facility Availability:** The ability to show available times in a calendar format. There is an option to details on why the facility is booked.
- **Rental Request:** The ability to search eligible facilities for availability. There is an option to estimate the rental rate and collect a deposit. There is functionality to restrict how far in the future a request is made. The rental requests can trigger an email to a designated user.
- **Rental Booking:** The ability to search eligible facilities for availability. The rental rate is calculated at time of rental. There is functionality to restrict how far in the future a rental is made. The rental requests can trigger an email to a designated user.
- **Quick Reserve:** The ability to search eligible facilities for availability. The Quick Reserve is a quicker means of booking than a rental as it reduces the options available to the customer. The rental rate is calculated at time of rental. There is functionality to restrict how far in the future a rental is made. The rental requests can trigger an email to a designated user.
- **Interactive Maps Reservation:** The ability to plot eligible facilities on a map, where the user can select the facility which they wish to reserve. This method of reservation is recommended for simpler types of reservations where viewing the location of the facility provides value to the customer.

ACTIVITY REGISTRATION REVIEW

In ACTIVE Net all registrations including activities, programs (flexible registration), private lessons and team registration (used to generate leagues) are displayed in the Public Interface in one central location. Programs (flexible registration) are separated from the rest in the Staff Interface. Key observations are listed below:

STRUCTURE OF ACTIVITIES

In ACTIVE Net, activity records are structured differently than in CLASS. Activities can be created in a hierarchical fashion, which thereby permits a more streamlined search and selection process in both the Staff and Public Interfaces. Using this technique, "sub-activities" are created below parent activities. However, registration can only be performed at the lowest record level. Grouping in terms of activities and sub-activities helps ensure cleaner navigation, however sub-activities need to mirror all of the primary search filtering criteria of its parent record to ensure consistency of search results.

FEE STRUCTURES

Activities in the County generally have a base fee with some activities also including an extra materials fee. It offers discounts through coupons, scholarships and for multiple registrants, all of which can be handled in ACTIVE Net.



ACTIVITY CATEGORIZATION

ACTIVE Net allows for the creation and application of two independent classification schemes to any activity and program created in the database. They can be thought of as primary and secondary categories and serve to aid customers and staff to find a specific activity in the database. The categories will be determined during the implementation process.

ACTIVITY NUMBERING

Activity numbers serve as unique identifiers for individual activities in the database, and ACTIVE Net can accommodate custom numbers or produce a system-generated number. The key benefit to custom numbering activities is that the numbers can be representative of activity data (e.g. season, category). Drawbacks for this numbering system include the fact that it involves adding another layer of manual entry when creating activities as the numbers have to be assigned manually. The key benefit to a system-generated numbering system is that it becomes a task which essentially removes itself from the activity management process, as the numbering is completed without the need for any staff interaction. The drawback for this numbering system involves it not being representative of any activity data. With that said, because there are so many additional attributes which define an activity instead of just the number, the need to maintain a representative numbering system is minimal. The preferred activity numbering method will also be determined during the implementation process.

SEASONS

Seasons in ACTIVE Net are designed to help group and manage activity creation. They are used to assist administrative staff in the maintenance of activities, and can also be used as a mechanism to help market activities to customers. While the ability to create various sets of seasons exists in ACTIVE Net, it is recommended as a best practice to adhere to a single set of seasons. This allows for easier searching of activities as well as backend management functions such as rolling activities over (copying) from season-to-season. This would also aid with reporting, as it would allow for cross-entity reporting on activities over a particular season or group of seasons. Please note that seasons do not need to coincide with activity dates, and are used simply as for categorization purposes. Each activity can have its own set of dates and meeting times; these do not have to be driven by the season.

The three entities of the County currently have different dates for each of their seasons and have a total of six seasons each. Although this can be accomplished in ACTIVE Net, a consolidated approach is recommended for the reasons listed above.

MEMBERSHIP REGISTRATION REVIEW

The County has a wide array of memberships including punch passes, seasonal passes as well as memberships for "friends" of the organization available at a reduced rate and some memberships applicable for reduced fees for classes. These memberships are used for entry into some facilities, for gathering information and for discounts at others.

Migrating to ACTIVE Net, the older class membership cards are recommended to be phased out in favor of new pass cards (such as pre-printed keychain tags). Considering the County has approximately 60,000 current members, data conversion would be a significant challenge if performed manually. Automated data conversion is also an option that should be considered more closely.

PUNCH PASSES

Punch passes generally do not have an expiry date with an exception of a few that have one year validity. In ACTIVE Net, only those punch passes with an expiry date can be renewed. In order to allow renewal of punch passes, all of them would require an expiry date in ACTIVE Net.

Montgomery County currently has activities such as skating classes which rely on the automatic issue of a six visit punch pass along with the activity registration. However, it cannot be configured as an optional purchase if treated as a prerequisite.



POINT OF SALE REVIEW

The Point Of Sale module in ACTIVE Net is similar to CLASS in most regards. One major difference is the replacement of Lookup Lists with the ability to create multiple "linked" button layouts to facilitate quick transactions. At the time of transaction processing, there is a hidden customer record annotated as "Drop-in customer" which is utilized if there isn't a need to associate a transaction to a customer account.

In CLASS, sales can be restricted to a particular workstation. ACTIVE Net manages inventory on a Site level and does not allow duplication of names. It does recognize barcodes and it is pending testing whether these barcodes can be used to link the same product to different Sites.

Point of Sale does not currently offer Public Access direct purchasing at this point in time, however products may be linked to Activities to facilitate purchases.

PROJECT SCHEDULING

The schedule for the project was proposed to commence in January 2014, with the main go-live date(s) occurring in January 2015. Implementation should initially focus on determining primary configuration settings for all modules before moving into service-specific requirements in later months. Various options for completion of the project were discussed, including the following:

- Pilot Go-Live: a portion of the County goes live at an earlier date (ideally two registration cycles in advance of the main deployment)
- Phased Go-Live: a staggered set of go-live dates are arranged to better manage the volume of data conversion, training staff and handling customer interactions.
- Mock Go-Live: a series of simulated go-live exercises are conducted in the Trainer Database to assist with gathering lessons learned and refine training and configuration requirements.

Each of these should be examined in greater depth, although a series of Mock Go-live exercises was determined to be a bonafide requirement of the project.

It is recognized that budgetary restrictions may have an impact on the timing of the project (such as for hiring dedicated PMs and/or System Administrators). It is strongly recommended to have all System Administrators must be in place prior to commencement of implementation activity, and ideally the Project Manager as well.



PROJECT TEAM

The most important requirement identified during discussion was the need for a dedicated Project Manager. This assignment should ideally be completed by the end of 2013 and would be required for the entire lifecycle of the project.

The Project Manager can also be the Primary System Administrator but for the size of the County it would be better to split the roles. Designating a System Administrator from each unit with at least one backup for each was determined to be the best structure. Below is a list of roles required for the project:

ROLE	DESCRIPTION
Project Manager	The Project Manager maintains primary responsibility within the organization for the successful implementation of ACTIVE Net, managing the Project Team in the accomplishment of this task.
Primary System Administrator	The individual with administrative access to all functionality within ACTIVE Net. This person will control what can and cannot be performed by end users, and who will administer business policies within the software. This individual will also be the primary point of contact for the ACTIVE Net Support Team. This person MUST be present throughout the duration of the project.
Secondary System Administrator	The ACTIVE Net System Administrator is key to the long term success of the implementation, so it is important to identify at least one backup per Core Business Unit (two is preferred).
Subject Matter Expert(s)	It is also ideal to have Subject Matter Expert(s) for each module with ACTIVE Net to work along with the System Administrators during the implementation.
Documentation Personnel	They are responsible for producing organization-specific manuals and references. These individual(s) should have strong writing skills and a thorough understanding of organizational processes and how they will relate to the use of ACTIVE Net.
Financial Representative(s)	It is important to ensure that a designated Financial Representative is in place to monitor ACTIVE Net Accounting functionality. A selection of reports are available within ACTIVE Net for this purpose and they should be reviewed on a daily, weekly and/or monthly basis by the selected individual to ensure that end users are performing transactions correctly, that the ACTIVE Net System Administrator has setup the system according to your organization's needs, and that the financial data within ACTIVE Net is accurate and pertinent.
Technical Representative(s)	This individual should be available "on call" during the lifespan of the software to assist with internet connectivity, database management, ACTIVE Net website upgrades, workstation and peripheral installations. The Project Consultant and Support Team may need to correspond with this individual on an as-needed basis to exchange technical notes, address network issues and revise security permissions.
Other Representative(s)	These individuals should be available on an as needed basis. They include Marketing, Legal, Training Development, Policy, and potentially others.



OUTSTANDING TASKS

This section outlines all tasks to be completed prior to commencement of implementation services and recommended due date. Tasks to be completed on an ongoing basis should be identified by your project team and outlined in your own customized Ongoing Procedures documentation.

ACTION ITEM	DESCRIPTION	DUE DATE
Appoint a Primary System Administrator and Secondary System Administrators.	A System Administrator is required to ensure effective and efficient use of ActiveNet. A system manager should be appointed so our support team will know who to direct important communications, including technical bulletins, newsletters, and notices.	December 1 2013
Complete keystone project planning documentation.	Use the project implementation tools as outlined during the initial project launch meeting and also referred to in the Deliverables section below, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Charter - Project Plan - Project Schedule - Stakeholder Assessment - Risk Assessment This will help roadmap project activities and facilitate improved planning.	December 1 2013
Identify volume of legacy customer and transaction data required for placement into ACTIVE Net.	Identify the volume and scale of information required for entry into ACTIVE Net and analyze the impacts of manual versus automated data conversion. A strategy should be ascertained well in advance of implementation.	October 15 2013
Complete scenario analysis for activities that must be recorded in ACTIVE Net.	Identify the various business scenarios that arise during daily business operations. Once you have established a comprehensive list, record these in the Test Assessment template. This will help streamline the implementation and testing processes.	December 1 2013
Complete email account creation and testing.	The IT team should ensure that any central email account(s) required for implementation are created, made available to a variety of different users and tested thoroughly, as this email address(es) will be used as a primary means of contact for the public.	January 1 2014
Initiate planning discussions and achieve consensus on all missing, incomplete, or conflicting policies as practical	Ascertain and document all applicable policies regarding organizational business processes such as cancellations, transfers, refunds, administration, overages/shortages and miscellaneous fees so they may be reflected accurately and consistently in the software.	January 1 2014

DELIVERABLES

This section defines the key verifiable products, results or capabilities that are recommended for completion by the project team in order to help realize its stated goals and objectives. Pre-formatted document templates are available for the majority of these items, which may be obtained through your Project Consultant. The deliverables list for the project includes the following items:

DELIVERABLE	DESCRIPTION	OWNER(S)
Project Charter	Identification of project objectives and measurement benchmarks.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Project Schedule	Overview of project timelines and scheduling of milestones.	Project Manager
Training Plan	Overview of employee training activities required for Go-Live.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Quick Reference Guides	Operational references for front desk employees utilizing the templated documents available from your project consultant.	Core Business Unit Representatives, Training Staff
Administrative Task List	Operational reference ongoing procedure list utilizing the templated document available from your project consultant.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Stakeholder Assessment	Identification of project stakeholders and communication needs.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Risk Assessment	Identification of project risks and mitigation strategies.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Project Plan	Overview of project policies and procedures of conduct.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Marketing Plan	Overview of marketing-related project activities.	Marketing Representatives
Deployment Plan	Overview of preparatory actions required prior to Go-Live.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Support Plan	Internal support procedures for assistance and escalation within the organization during and after Go-Live.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Audit Assessment	Consolidated list of audit results used as a reference for completing additional data entry and correction.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
Test Assessment	Consolidated list of business case test results used as a reference for completing additional data configuration, testing, and procedures.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives
User Feedback Forms	Feedback collection document for participants in a focus group meeting for Public Access.	Project Manager, Marketing Representatives
Customer Feedback Forms	Feedback collection document for participants in a soft launch or Go-Live dry run for Public Access.	Project Manager, Marketing Representatives
Project Evaluation	Summary of issues resolved and lessons learned for future reference when conducting similar projects in the future.	Project Manager, Core Business Unit Representatives